

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17816/RJLS552000>

Research Article



# The Most Common Type of Political Regime under Capitalism

A.D. Kerimov

Institute of State and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia

## Abstract

In this article, the author proposes that the most common type of political regime lies beneath the dominance of capital plutocracy. The author differentiates opposing trends in specific actions taken by various factions of the ruling class to define their value orientations. The article focuses on the pro-Western fifth column, a prominent class in our country, comprising individual representatives of power structures and open-minded professionals, while expressing full support for a part of the domestic establishment (headed by the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin) and the associated patriotic intelligentsia whose aim is to comprehensively revive Russia's power. At the same time, the author believes that the mobilization of all institutions of the state and society is necessary to defeat the collective West, a feat that is only possible by upholding the fundamental foundations of capitalism.

**Keywords:** plutocracy; capitalism; power; injustice; state; intelligentsia; bourgeoisie; Constitution; patriotism; liberalism.

## To cite this article

Kerimov AD. The most common type of political regime under capitalism. *Russian journal of legal studies*. 2023;10(3):31–40. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17816/RJLS552000>

Received: 17.07.2023

Accepted: 10.09.2023

Published: 30.09.2023

УДК 340

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17816/RJLS552000>

Научная статья

## Самый распространенный тип политического режима при капитализме

А.Д. Керимов

Институт государства и права Российской академии наук, Москва, Россия

### Аннотация

В статье последовательно проводится мысль о том, что в условиях господства капитала плутократия есть наиболее распространенный тип политического режима. Дается ее дефиниция. Выделяются две противоположные тенденции в определении различными сегментами правящих элит современных государств своих ценностных установок и, соответственно, направлений конкретно-практической деятельности. Обращается внимание на то, что активно действующая в нашей стране прозападная пятая колонна состоит не только из либерально ориентированных лиц творческих профессий, но и отдельных представителей властных структур. Автор выражает всемерную поддержку той части отечественного истеблишмента (во главе с Президентом РФ В.В. Путиным) и связанной с ней патриотически настроенной интеллигенцией, которая ставит своей целью всестороннее возрождение могущества России. Он вместе с тем считает, что для достижения победы над коллективным Западом необходима понимаемая в широком смысле мобилизация всех институтов государства и общества, которая невозможна без отказа от субстанциональных основ капитализма.

**Ключевые слова:** плутократия; капитализм; власть; несправедливость; государство; интеллигенция; буржуазия; Конституция; патриотизм; либерализм.

### Как цитировать

Керимов А.Д. Самый распространенный тип политического режима при капитализме // Российский журнал правовых исследований. 2023. Т. 10. № 3. С. 31–40. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17816/RJLS552000>

The entire world and its diverse ethnic groups are affected by a grave societal challenge known as social injustice. This challenge represents a distinctive aspect not only in ancient times but also in the current phase of the historical development of humanity. From time immemorial, people have suffered unjustly and continue to do so. Its numerous overt and concealed unsightly manifestations, whether visible or obscured from casual observation, consistently trample on the rights and freedoms of individuals, cruelly undermining their honor and dignity, and instilling unbelief and disappointment in their hearts. These manifestations can be easily found everywhere, in virtually every facet of public life, proving particularly true in the area of state law, as demonstrated by the prevalence of plutocracy, both in the past and, especially in contemporary times, as the most common form of political regime.

\*\*\*

To begin, we aim to provide a precise, clear, and most suitable definition of the concept, which is described as follows: Plutocracy, derived from ancient Greek “πλούτος” (wealth) and “κράτος” (power, force, and authority), represents a distinct type of political regime (in the presence of a high property electoral qualification, it is also considered as an element of the form of government) characterized by the fact that real power in the state belongs to the wealthiest segments of the population, the most affluent citizens. Consequently, vital decisions that significantly impact the people are either directly made by their prosperous representatives or are the result of their deliberate, intensive, and effective influence over state institutions and structures. Individuals possessing considerable wealth thus wield power both directly and indirectly. This privilege is a constant, irrespective of whether they possess the necessary personal qualities, abilities, skills, extensive knowledge, life experience, and wisdom, or the required level of intellectual development, education, and professionalism. This is undeniably unjust. As A.S. Panarin (1940–2003) cogently emphasizes, it is impossible to neglect the fact that people who have secured a monopoly on state leadership possess the capacity to profoundly transform society and disrupt its conventional, habitual course of life [1, p. 14].

The power of the wealthy is determined by various factors. First, in a class-stratified social system, material, and financial affluence, to varying degrees, invariably secure political and often ideological dominance. Second,

those who legitimately or through force take control of the highest tiers of government, whether through national elections or armed means, accumulate substantial wealth and resources over time. These resources are the products of both natural and human labor, and the governing authority gains the exclusive right to own, utilize, and manage this wealth. Power and wealth are intricately interdependent, continually reinforcing each other. In societies characterized by exploitation (which currently dominate the world), the prevalence of plutocracy is a comprehensible phenomenon, and as such, it is widespread almost everywhere. It is difficult, if not impossible, to identify a country in which the said political regime has not taken root.

Unsurprisingly, the primary objective of the ruling class is to maintain the status quo, safeguard the hegemony of the elite, and protect their assets, fundamental caste values, interests, and customary way of life by any means necessary. Additionally, they perform functions and tasks that are de facto significant and beneficial for all members of society.

Under the capitalist mode of production, the bourgeoisie, or the ruling class, holds this position of power. The assertion made by Karl Marx (1818–1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820–1895) in their renowned work “Manifesto of the Communist Party”, in which they characterize the state as a committee that serves the interest of a given class, remains fundamentally accurate [2, p. 27].<sup>1</sup>

It is worth noting that this perspective is not exclusive to supporters of Marxism; it finds agreement with many great thinkers who do not align with the core tenets of this doctrine. Leo Tolstoy (1828–1910), for example, shared a similar viewpoint. He famously likened the state to a gang of robbers and expressed preference for the latter [4, p. 263].

The above Marxist assertion remains undeniably relevant in the present day, with a crucial distinction: the situation has worsened since then. The committee responsible for managing the affairs of capitalists now primarily operates to protect and enhance the benefits, privileges, and advantages, not for the entire social group,

<sup>1</sup> Here one cannot help but draw attention to an extremely significant, but constantly, stubbornly and maliciously ignored circumstance that the founders of Marxist theory understood perfectly well, and certainly no worse than others, that the state inevitably performs functions that satisfy, among other things, common interests, demands and needs. They clearly realized that its role, obviously, is not at all limited to class domination. This is indicated, in particular, by G.A. Bagaturia (1929–2020), whose opinion as a leading Marxist specialist should certainly be recognized as competent [3, p. 137].

but primarily for its upper tiers. This elite effectively governs specific countries, often exerting global influence. It includes high-ranking officials, influential political figures, financial magnates, major industrialists and entrepreneurs, media leaders, heads of religious denominations, distinguished intellectuals, and anyone who wields power in critical fields such as economics, politics, culture, military, administrative, information, and communication. These individuals possess the capacity to profoundly alter the course of events and exert decisive influence on the destinies of nations.

Furthermore, this elite progressing today. It seeks to privatize, or has already privatized, the state apparatus, as has occurred in the United States, Western Europe, and many other countries. This ambition is quite understandable, driven by an insatiable egoistic desire to strip away a significant part of the state's inherent nature, and a priori purpose, which inherently addresses issues and problems of a broader social scope. The dominant authorities, or at least the majority of them are determined to use the enormous resources<sup>2</sup> initially earmarked for the state exclusively for their selfish interests. They aim to transform the state into an efficiently operating business entity primarily serving their selfish concerns. Regrettably, they frequently achieve this goal. Consequently, the prevailing atmosphere and ethos that characterize the vast majority of contemporary powers, both large and small, can be aptly described using a vivid quatrain from N.A. Nekrasov's (1821–1878) poem "Contemporaries":

Plutocrat, like a guard,  
Will stand sentinel  
And there will be indiscriminate robbery,  
And a crrrash will happen! [6, p. 289].

And indeed, it has happened. Yet, it is vital to remember that, as J.-J. Rousseau (1712–1778) aptly pointed out, there is nothing more detrimental than the influence of private interests on public affairs, especially state affairs [7, p. 15].

\*\*\*

In this stage of history, we are witnessing an escalating conflict occurring virtually worldwide, spanning all continents and each republic or monarchy. This conflict

<sup>2</sup> About a hundred years ago, J. Ortega y Gasset (1883–1955) reasonably noted that the state had turned into a monstrous machine of unimaginable capabilities, acting with fantastic precision and efficiency. It, according to the Spanish philosopher, is the center of society, where just pressing a button is enough for huge levers to process every inch of the social body with lightning speed [5, p. 128–129].

centers on two divergent trajectories of development, two opposing trends. The first, a clearly detrimental and highly destructive course for humanity, individual countries, and their populations, stems from a deeply flawed and immoral scheme. Unfortunately, this arrangement is often successfully implemented by any means necessary, using various tools, ingenious techniques, and sophisticated political strategies. It involves the seizure of public power institutions and their adaptation to serve the interests of a select few. Pursuing such a course forebodes an imminent future characterized by bureaucratic arbitrariness, lawlessness, lack of rights, mass impoverishment, and the exacerbation of long-standing tensions between the state and the society it governs. This deterioration of their essential purpose leads to their weakening, withering, decay, and ultimately, their death.

The second trajectory is fundamentally different, clearly distinguishable, and undeniably positive. It reflects the genuine intent of the ruling elite, imbued with an altruistic mission of ensuring the full orientation of relevant institutions toward the comprehensive protection of national interests, the welfare of ordinary citizens, and mobilizing the populace for the grand plan that history Demiurge has destined for them. The predominance of this trajectory promises prosperity and well-being, provided that these intentions and ideas are genuinely integrated into the value system of the elite.

It is worth noting that, in many countries, even among the highest tiers of society, the most privileged segment of the establishment is far from ethically homogeneous or unanimous. Their representatives do not necessarily adhere to similar axiological attitudes, rules, and norms, which determine their attitudes toward the rest of society. On the contrary, their views and beliefs regarding what is moral and acceptable, and what is immoral and unacceptable, often differ significantly and can be explicitly antagonistic.

As a result, some individuals within the ruling class, motivated by shortsightedness, act extremely cynically and immorally, constantly pursuing their selfish interests and material desires. In contrast, others within the same class do not seek to distance themselves from the people but acknowledge their deep and lasting connection with them. These individuals naturally prioritize the needs, hopes, and aspirations of their fellow citizens, inspired by their love for their homeland, selflessness, and dedication to its progressive development and a brighter future.

It is worth noting that among intellectual workers, it is usually customary to strongly criticize and censure the authorities. This criticism is often broad, superficial, and indiscriminate, accusing all representatives of the ruling elite of pursuing profit and greedy acquisition, devoid of adherence to higher ideals. This perspective is driven by the prevailing mentality among the intelligentsia, which has, particularly in the era of liberalism, become fashionable. It is considered an essential attribute and an unwavering rule of decorum. This mentality can be characterized as follows: Power, by its very nature, is inherently detrimental and invariably hostile to society and the individual, leading to a persistent and unwavering rebellion against it. Yet, it's evident to any rational observer that such a perspective does not fully correspond with reality, resulting in an unjustified and unconstructive approach.

In the long run, persisting in this stance may lead to alignment with radical anarchists who fundamentally reject the need for official public power. As B.N. Chicherin (1828–1904) argued that the Russian liberal theoretically does not recognize any authority at all and only obeys the laws they approve of. This perspective sees the state's most essential functions as oppressive, with generally binding norms, officials, police, and the like seen as products of despotism<sup>3</sup>. Remarkably, the judgment expressed by the Russian philosopher, historian, and lawyer more than 150 years ago remains relevant today.

The ambivalence in how the contemporary liberal-minded intelligentsia perceives power lies in the fact that, on one hand, it harbors a strong aversion toward government agencies and ministers and parliamentarians in disdain. On the other hand, there is a palpable fear of being abandoned by their protection and patronage, leaving them alone with something incomprehensible: the uneducated masses. Many among them fear the rise of ochlocracy (mob rule), which is a reasonable concern. As a result, they often unconsciously gravitate towards endorsing a strong state, recognizing the clear and pressing necessity of such modern conditions, as we believe.

\*\*\*

In Russia and several other countries, a confrontation is underway between the two factions of the ruling elite, as well as the intellectuals who sympathize with and align

each of these factions. In this scenario, the state and its institutions serve as both the battleground for this conflict and the highly sought-after prize, making the situation exceedingly acute, particularly in recent times. Specifically in Russia, with the escalation of tensions with the North Atlantic Alliance and, especially after the commencement of a special military operation in Ukraine, which President V.V. Putin referred to as being under Western control<sup>4</sup>, this exacerbation has become strikingly evident. It could hardly have unfolded differently.

Regrettably, we must acknowledge that from the mid-1980s onwards, the United States and its NATO allies managed, rather swiftly, to attract a significant number of politicians, officials, scientists, cultural figures, and even ordinary citizens to their side in Russia. This was achieved through various means, including direct recruitment by intelligence services and plain bribery. As a result, they could establish a substantial fifth column in Russia. Those recruited into this faction exhibit a pronounced cosmopolitanism<sup>5</sup> and, from a moral standpoint, are often unscrupulous. Among them, one can find individuals who might be described as “famous,” or rather, “infamous” general officers, and even common “soldiers” who seemingly appeared out of nowhere. Over the years, they

<sup>4</sup> The Address of the President of the Russian Federation to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation dated February 21, 2023. Available at the following URL: <http://www.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/70565> (date of access: 06/30/2023).

<sup>5</sup> The Russian philosophical tradition is characterized by a sharp denunciation of a worldview infected with cosmopolitanism in the social reality. However, it is fair to note that sometimes, as in the case of L.N. Tolstoy, we encounter an opposing viewpoint, although it is not prevalent in our opinion. Nevertheless, Russian scientific and intellectual heritage is replete with merciless and convincing debunking of cosmopolitanism. In this context, N.A. Berdyaev (1874–1948) stands out. He believes that both philosophically and practically, the phenomenon called cosmopolitanism is completely untenable, as it is nothing more than a mere abstraction or utopia. Cosmopolitanism does not live up to its name; it lacks cosmic hierarchical level with defined individualities, because there is nothing cosmic in it; after all, the cosmos and the world are hierarchical levels, specifically defined individualities. Each individual person joins cosmic, universal life exclusively through deep immersion, creative growth into national life, through the life of all individual hierarchical levels, which is understood by Nikolai Berdyaev as the individual, the nation, the entire human race, the universe, and God. Therefore, he considers cosmopolitanism as an unattainable expression of a dream for a united and fraternal, essentially ideal humanity, which negates and extinguishes the idea of an abstract person and humanity.

Regarding L.N. Tolstoy's position, N.A. Berdyaev rightly notes that even Tolstoy's non-resistance, seemingly a departure from everything associated with nationality, ultimately reveals itself to be inherently national and Russian. This paradox arises from the fact that a formal renunciation of nationality can be purely national [8, p. 94–95, 97].

<sup>3</sup> B.N. Chicherin, “Measure and boundaries,” first published in *Nashe vremya* of 1862, No. 11. URL: [http://dugward.ru/library/gosipravo/chicherin\\_mera\\_i\\_granicy.html](http://dugward.ru/library/gosipravo/chicherin_mera_i_granicy.html) (access date: 06/30/2023).

have consistently demonstrated a fanatical commitment to the values prevailing in the West, which are rapidly degenerating and often marked by cynical hypocrisy. Furthermore, this group demonstrates a depressingly uncritical and often erroneous understanding of the theoretical systems, compositions, and constructs that originated in the field of humanities and social science in the West. Additionally, their perception of the flawed implementation of these theories in practice is inadequate.

These individuals, who appear to serve the interests of our nation's adversaries, are unwavering in their subservience and can be seen as betrayers of their own people. They are, in essence, mere imitators of the teachings, doctrines, often pseudoscientific claims, moral standards, and value systems that collectively form the ideological foundation of what we refer to as the modern civilized world. However, their understanding of fundamental social concepts such as justice, morality, freedom, democracy, and individual rights is often one-sided, fundamentally flawed, simplistic, and ultimately twisted.<sup>6</sup>

Their objective has never included and still does not include, the thoughtful and creative development of the best achievements of the Western world's intellectual and spiritual heritage, which has evolved over the past millennia. Instead, they seek to forcefully and mechanically introduce foreign, often meager unproductive, and alien interpretations into the rich tapestry of Russian culture. This approach inevitably erodes any transcendental principles.

Members of this "fifth column" display cold indifference and a seeming disregard for the pressing needs and requirements of their fellow Russian citizens. However, they are representatives of powerful oligarchs and influential Western politicians, acting as advocates for American and European capital. These individuals demonstrate remarkable sensitivity toward personal, and primarily material, gain, showing a sincere concern for their own comfort, convenience, and well-being. Their pursuit of success, even if based on a misunderstood definition of success, has become the overriding guiding principle in their lives, pursued at almost any cost. Interestingly, they appear to be largely unfamiliar with other motivations for meaningful and purposeful human activity.

Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900) made an astute observation regarding individuals with such self-serving

tendencies. He noted that these "vulgar natures" (who are sometimes considered part of the fifth column) are unwavering in their pursuit of personal profit. Their "wisdom" and self-interest lie in their ability to resist temptations of the heart and avoid inappropriate actions [11, p. 47]. It is not surprising that they have honed their skills in the art of trading in national interests, turning their unscrupulous and questionable actions into a well-organized and highly profitable private enterprise.

Profound and noble feelings of responsibility toward one's homeland and the eternal sacred duty to it, along with devotion to one's people, often elicit instinctive, unconscious rejection, cynical and demonstrative neglect, and undisguised mockery from certain individuals. Friedrich Nietzsche's impartial words capture this sentiment well: "If they are personally convinced of the absence of selfish intentions and profits, then a noble person seems to them like a fool: they disdain him in his delight and mock the sparkle in his eyes. 'How can you rejoice in your own loss? How can you willingly be a loser?' they wonder, assuming some kind of mental illness must be associated with noble inclinations" [11, p. 46–47]. These individuals seem unable to comprehend the obvious and irrefutable fact that service to higher, supra-individual goals<sup>7</sup>, the conscious and persistent cultivation of deep patriotic sentiments, and the spiritualization of one's personality infuse life with a special and sacred purpose.

However, patriotism and selfless love for one's native homeland are intrinsic qualities of the entire Russian ethnic group as a whole, as well as the overwhelming majority of its integral Russian intelligentsia. A similar ideological stance and corresponding psychological state have consistently been part of the true Russian intelligentsia. For example, we can consider the views of the eminent representative, M.E. Saltykov-Shchedrin (1826–1889). He believed that the concept of a commonwealth nurtured patriotism. No matter how confined the scope of its influence may be (even if only with the borders of the Principality of Monaco), it remains the sole connection that links us to a particular environment, allowing us to share in the joys and sorrows that often have only a distant impact. After his thought, the writer emphasized the profound educational value of

<sup>6</sup> It is about the inadmissibility of such an interpretation of these concepts that the Primate of the Russian Orthodox Church, Patriarch Kirill, logically, convincingly, and wisely argues [9, p. 79–104, etc.; 10].

<sup>7</sup> N.A. Berdyaev, perhaps, was right when, in 1932, he argued that the calling to serve a super-personal goal, the great whole, reflecting a religious understanding of life, had weakened in Europe since the Renaissance and had now been supplanted by the prevailing perspectives of a liberal and individualistic nature, essential the opposite [12, p. 62].

patriotism in developing an individual's understanding of the idea of humanity [13, p. 169].

\*\*\*

We believe that in the current era, despite the immense challenges, incredible difficulties, and unpredictable fluctuations, including mortal dangers and threats stemming from the hostile and clearly destructive policies of the Western world and the activities of the fifth column financed by it, there are still valid reasons for an optimistic outlook on the future. Encouragingly, there have been fundamental positive shifts that inspire a sense of calm confidence. These changes represent a qualitative and, hopefully, irreversible transformation in the understanding of social realities, both on an intrastate and international scale, not only among the majority of ordinary individuals but also among a substantial portion of the ruling class. This is of very significance, as it is the authorities who are responsible for making decisions that carry far-reaching implications for everyone.

The impression is undoubtedly justified, supported by concrete facts, that many of the top leaders of Russia, led by President V. V. Putin, are deeply committed to the well-being of their fellow citizens. They are wholeheartedly focused on addressing the needs and demands of the people and safeguarding the interests of the entire nation. Their primary goal is to swiftly elevate our homeland to a preeminent global position, fully restoring its status as a great empire while standing firm against the mounting pressure from the North Atlantic Alliance. One clear indication of this commitment is the comprehensive constitutional reform of 2020 initiated by the President of Russia. These amendments, undeniably profound and far-reaching in nature, are designed to reinforce the fundamental pillars of our society and state.

A notable aspect of this reform is the emphasis on safeguarding the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Russian Federation. The constitution now explicitly prohibits any action aimed at alienating any part of Russian territory, except border delimitation, demarcation, and re-demarcation with neighboring countries (Part 2,<sup>1</sup> Article 67(c))<sup>8</sup>. This includes stringent but, in our view, completely adequate and equitable requirements for officials at various levels of government. Notably, these requirements

pertain to restrictions related to holding citizenship or a residence permit from another state or possessing documents confirming the right of permanent residence in a foreign country by a Russian citizen. Furthermore, they include restrictions regarding the maintenance of accounts, deposits, funds, and assets in foreign banks (as outlined in Part 3 of Article 77, Part 5 of Article 78, Part 2 of Article 81(c), among others). We should also emphasize the provisions that establish the supremacy of the Constitution of the Russian Federation over decisions made by international bodies (in particular, Article 79(c)). These, along with other other constitutional provisions, are of no less importance in maintaining the integrity and sovereignty of our nation.

However, perhaps the most significant aspect in this context is the fact that the 2020 edition of the Constitution outlines a monumental task, a comprehensive strategic goal. This objective is not intended for the distant future but, on the contrary, is geared towards immediate progress in completely reviving and enhancing Russia's former strength and influence in every aspect. The ultimate aim is to secure Russia's status as a global superstar for all time. The pursuit of this objective is undoubtedly aligned with the deep-seated hopes and messianic expectations of the Russian people. It reflects their belief in being chosen by God and their providential role in history, which in turn corresponds to our authentic and unshakable national interests. These fundamental principles and ideas should be interpreted in this light. They are embedded in the amendments to the Constitution that received unanimous approval in the all-Russian vote on July 1, 2020. This constitutional revision recognizes Russia as the legal successor (legal subsequent proprietor) of the USSR (Part 1 of Article 67(c))<sup>9</sup>, emphasizing continuity in the development of the Russian state (Part 2 of Article 67(c))<sup>9</sup>. This interpretation is unequivocal, as it aligns with the historical reality that, throughout most of their existence, Kievan Rus, the Russian Tsardom, the Russian Empire, and the Soviet Union were all formidable and influential states.

<sup>9</sup> One can only enthusiastically welcome the fact that on June 17, the last day of the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum 2023, on the shores of the Gulf of Finland, opposite the park of the 300th anniversary of the Northern capital, three giant flags were raised on almost 180-meter, the highest flagpoles in Europe, namely white-blue-red (tricolor of Peter I (1672–1825)), black-yellow-white (approved by decree of Alexander II (1818–1881)), and red (of the socialist period), symbolizing the unity of our people, its present and past generations, the dialectical interrelation and continuity of various stages of national history.

<sup>8</sup> Below in the text, paragraphs, parts of articles and the articles themselves of the Constitution of the Russian Federation are designated in accordance with established abbreviations: "p.," "cl.," "C."

Numerous facts, not limited to the legal domain that is commonly familiar to us, can be cited as evidence of the unwavering and determined efforts of a significant portion of the top leadership, including President V.V. Putin at the helm. They rally the entire society, including the ruling class, in pursuit of these objectives and the numerous other challenges facing our homeland today. There is no doubt that such mobilization is imperative. Without it, we would be able to effectively counter the United States and the entire Western collective, which has, for many centuries, and especially in the present historical moment, shown a keen interest in undermining the Russian world. Their strategic goal is to bring about a significant defeat, a stance repeated by the President<sup>10</sup>. This mobilization is not only vital for ensuring the continued progressive and comprehensive evolution of our nation but also for solidifying its recently acquired status as a superstate. Moreover, it is crucial to address the formidable and often existential challenges of our time, which pose a significant threat to our homeland.

\*\*\*

A crucial question arises: Can a comprehensive mobilization, not merely in a military sense but involving a broader societal mobilization involving all institutions and structures of society and the state, be successfully achieved while operating within the capitalist system and the corresponding plutocratic regime?

The answer to this question is resoundingly negative. It does not require exhaustive proof, with all the intricate details, to establish that capitalism and the perpetually sustained plutocracy at various levels and in various institutions of public power are profoundly unjust and immoral. These systems contaminate the entire social fabric, have a corrosive impact on individuals' thoughts and feelings, distort interpersonal relationships, and compound the often already somber destinies of people. The increasing immorality and moral decay of this system, exemplified by the consumer society it has spawned, are rooted in the inhumanity and inherent destructiveness of its core axiom, succinctly put in everyday language: everything is for sale and everything is up for purchase, including bodies and souls.

The dogma, vigorously imposed by liberal-leaning representatives of the bourgeois ruling elite of the majority

of countries worldwide, regrettably accepted by a significant portion of their populations as absolute truth, is an abnormal and repugnant guiding principle for life. It operates like an unrelenting, harsh, malevolent force, exerting a fatal influence on the minds, inclinations, preferences, and ultimately, the daily conduct of the general populace.

It is abundantly clear that various forms of property, particularly natural resources shaped by nature over millions of years and human creations in the realms of science and art, should, under no circumstance, be in private hands. They belong in the public domain and should be exempt from private ownership, utilization, and disposal.

Furthermore, it is evident that private property should not always be regarded, as is often maliciously and occasionally mistakenly asserted, as the most effective form of ownership. The Soviet Union, for example, achieved remarkable successes in various domains, including segments of the economy, despite not having private ownership of the means of production, a free market, or competition. Instead, it operated with a planned economy, motivated workers, and a well-functioning incentive system that combined both material and non-material rewards and penalties.

A broad historical perspective of Russian civilization, without dwelling on trivial details and minor aspects, allows us to assert responsibly that the zenith of our empire's development was reached during the era of socialism. Despite its undeniable flaws and drawbacks, this represents a clear and indisputably triumph of the Russian world, embodied in the outstanding achievements of the USSR. This success is entirely natural and logical, as it aligns with the fundamental law of purposeful human activity, as articulated by A.J. Toynbee (1889–1975). According to this English historian, to achieve a specific goal, one should strive not only for the goal itself but also for something more sublime, situated far beyond it [14, p. 528]<sup>11</sup>. This principle is universal and applicable to individuals, ethnic groups, religious institutions<sup>12</sup>, and states. The Soviet Union, with its diverse population, consistently aspired to objectives higher than GDP growth and the material enrichment of its citizens. In our homeland, the longed-for

<sup>11</sup> It is not surprising that A.S. Panarin, who had an amazing gift for cultural and historical world perception, a subtle instinct, and to some extent even the insight of a seer (which is obvious when studying his major scientific monographs), paid special attention to these arguments of A.J. Toynbee [15, p. 53].

<sup>12</sup> The scientist outlined this postulate when reflecting on the universal churches.

<sup>10</sup> Address of the President of the Russian Federation to the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation dated February 21, 2023. URL: <http://www.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/70565> (date of access: 06/30/2023).



and noble dream of a brighter and more just future has always been an integral and enduring part of our collective consciousness.

In light of these factors and more, it becomes unequivocally clear that a comprehensive mobilization of Russian society and the apparatus of public power, as described at the outset of this article, can only be realized by decisively rejecting the fundamental economic, political,

spiritual, and moral underpinnings of the bourgeois system, particularly the plutocracy regime. It is gratifying to observe that the understanding of this truth, the undeniable imperative for such a rejection, albeit at a gradual, step-by-step pace, is slowly occurring among the most responsible, humanistically oriented members of the ruling elite in Russia. This progressive trend; unquestionably requires support from various sources, especially from the intelligentsia.

## REFERENCES

1. Panarin AS. Global'noe politicheskoe prognozirovaniye v usloviyakh strategicheskoi nestabil'nosti. Moscow: Editorial URSS; 1999. (In Russ.).
2. Marks K, Engel's F. Manifest Kommunisticheskoi partii. Moscow: Politizdat; 1970. (In Russ.).
3. Bagaturiya GA. Kontury gryadushchego. Izbrannye proizvedeniya. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta; 2014. (In Russ.).
4. Tolstoi LN. Polnoe sobranie sochinenii. T. 45. Put' zhizni. 1910. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo khudozhestvennoi literatury; 1956. (In Russ.).
5. Ortega-i-Gasset Kh. Vosstanie mass. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo AST; 2020. (In Russ.).
6. Necresov NA. Stikhotvoreniya NA. Nekrasova. Posmertnoe izdanie. T. III. Saint Petersburg: Tipografiya M.M. Stasyulevicha; 1879. (In Russ.).
7. Petrov PP, Berlin YaV. Aforizmy: po inostrannym istochnikam. Moscow: Progress; 1985. (In Russ.).
8. Berdyaev NA. Sud'ba Rossii. Opyty po psikhologii voiny i natsional'nosti. Moscow: Izdanie G.A. Lemana, S.I. Sakharova; 1918. (In Russ.).
9. Kirill, Patriarkh Moskovskii i vseya Rusi. Sem' slov o russkom mire. Moscow: Vsemirnyi Russkii Narodnyi Sobor; 2015. (In Russ.).
10. Kirill, Patriarkh Moskovskii i vseya Rusi. Slovo o traditsii i sovremennom obshchestve. Moscow: Vsemirnyi Russkii Narodnyi Sobor; 2016. (In Russ.).
11. Nitshe F. Veselaya nauka. Zlaya mudrost'. Moscow: Eksmo; 2008. (In Russ.).
12. Berdyaev NA. Dukhovnoe sostoyanie sovremennogo mira. *Put' Organ" russkoi religioznoi mysli*. 1932;(35). (In Russ.).
13. Saltykov-Shchedrin ME. Sobranie sochinenii. T. 7. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya literature; 1969. (In Russ.).
14. Toinbi ADzh. Postizhenie istorii. Moscow: Airis-press; 2010. (In Russ.).
15. Panarin AS. Rossiya v tsiklakh mirovoi istorii. Moscow Izdatel'stvo MGU;1999. (In Russ.).

## СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1. Панарин А.С. Глобальное политическое прогнозирование в условиях стратегической нестабильности. Москва: Эдиториал УРСС, 1999.
2. Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Манифест Коммунистической партии. Москва: Политиздат, 1970.
3. Багатурия Г.А. Контуры грядущего. Избранные произведения. Москва: Издательство Московского университета, 2014.
4. Толстой Л.Н. Полное собрание сочинений. Т. 45. Путь жизни. 1910. Москва: Государственное издательство художественной литературы, 1956.
5. Ортега-и-Гассет Х. Восстание масс. Москва: Издательство АСТ, 2020.
6. Некрасов Н.А. Стихотворения Н.А. Некрасова. Посмертное издание. Т. III. Санкт-Петербург. Типография М.М. Стасюлевича, 1879.
7. Петров П.П., Берлин Я.В. Афоризмы: по иностранным источникам. Москва: Прогресс, 1985.
8. Бердяев Н.А. Судьба России. Опыты по психологии войны и национальности. Москва: Издание Г.А. Лемана, С.И. Сахарова, 1918.
9. Кирилл, Патриарх Московский и всея Руси. Семь слов о русском мире. Москва: Всемирный Русский Народный Собор, 2015.
10. Кирилл, Патриарх Московский и всея Руси. Слово о традиции и современном обществе. Москва: Всемирный Русский Народный Собор, 2016.
11. Ницше Ф. Веселая наука. Злая мудрость. Москва: Эксмо, 2008.
12. Бердяев Н.А. Духовное состояние современного мира // Путь. Органь русской религиозной мысли. 1932. № 35.
13. Салтыков-Щедрин М.Е. Собрание сочинений. Т. 7. Москва: Художественная литература, 1969.
14. Тойнби А.Дж. Постижение истории. Москва: Айрис-пресс, 2010.
15. Панарин А.С. Россия в циклах мировой истории. Москва: Издательство МГУ, 1999.

## AUTHOR INFORMATION

**Alexander Dzh. Kerimov**, doctor of law, professor, chief researcher; eLibrary SPIN: 7041-9829; e-mail: 8017498@mail.ru

## ОБ АВТОРЕ

**Александр Джангирович Керимов**, доктор юридических наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник; eLibrary SPIN: 7041-9829; e-mail: 8017498@mail.ru